

To: Torchia, Carla (EC/EC)[carla.torchia@canada.ca]
From: Schardt, James
Sent: Wed 2/3/2016 2:31:31 PM
Subject: RE: Including drafting of priorities for science and actions RE: Progress Report of the Parties

Thanks for that context.

By the way, I forwarded Chris the LAMP binational.net/GLIN note... and I'm realizing he just does not look at Secretariat stuff until our Thursday AM meeting (unless crazily important). Seems like the best way to get things past U.S. review/approval is to build a long list of stuff for Chris to run through each Thursday AM, for what it is worth. Anyway, I'm slowly figuring out how John Haugland did it! ☺

From: Torchia, Carla (EC/EC) [<mailto:carla.torchia@canada.ca>]
Sent: Tuesday, February 02, 2016 3:56 PM
To: Schardt, James <schardt.james@epa.gov>; Kumar, Ashij (EC/EC) <ashij.kumar@canada.ca>
Subject: RE: Including drafting of priorities for science and actions RE: Progress Report of the Parties

Hi Jamie - a couple of things, let's keep the two separate and keep going on developing drafts.

(By the way, Jennifer's not wedded to including mike's latest thoughts on binational priorities for science and action in the email to leads if that's going to hold us up; suggest we don't include for now to get Annex leads going on this exercise.)

Carla

From: Schardt, James [<mailto:schardt.james@epa.gov>]
Sent: February 2, 2016 9:23 AM
To: Kumar, Ashij (EC/EC); Torchia, Carla (EC/EC)
Subject: RE: Including drafting of priorities for science and actions RE: Progress Report of the Parties

Carla and Ash,

I haven't heard much discussion on this side about the top-down approach for Science priorities. My guess is that Chris will need to consult a bit on that idea before deciding (but I don't know for sure). It could take some time.

My personal thinking, given Jen's latest email, is we should go back to separating the report writing task and send out that email ASAreasonablyP... and then have more Secretariat discussion on how to handle the Science Priorities task. I'm pretty sure Chris would be okay with that and I could quickly ask for an okay on that approach. Just let me know.

-j

From: McKay, Jennifer (EC/EC) [<mailto:jennifer.mckay@canada.ca>]

Sent: Monday, February 01, 2016 4:06 PM

To: Schardt, James <schardt.james@epa.gov>; Korleski, Christopher <korleski.christopher@epa.gov>

Cc: Kumar, Ashij (EC/EC) <ashij.kumar@canada.ca>; Torchia, Carla (EC/EC) <carla.torchia@canada.ca>

Subject: RE: Including drafting of priorities for science and actions RE: Progress Report of the Parties

Hi Jamie,

Thanks for that. Sorry – we've been in back to back meetings today. We'll get you some language on the progress report tomorrow.

With respect to the binational priorities for science and action, Mike expressed the view that he

doesn't just want Annex leads to identify priorities but rather for our Science Annex leads to take a top down approach and identify science priorities for the various annexes/issues. He suggested that there should be only one or two science priorities. I think this makes sense, and hope that you would agree with that.

Jennifer

From: Schardt, James [<mailto:schardt.james@epa.gov>]
Sent: February 1, 2016 12:20 PM
To: McKay, Jennifer (EC/EC); Korleski, Christopher
Cc: Kumar, Ashij (EC/EC); Torchia, Carla (EC/EC)
Subject: Including drafting of priorities for science and actions RE: Progress Report of the Parties

Jen, we had a quick chat over here and think it's probably a good idea to send a single email that has both the draft PRP Chapter and the task of drafting priorities for science and action. That way we can give the Annex leads a single email with the all the relevant timelines/deadlines.

I can work with you to prepare a draft, just let me know.

(It does seem like the domestic action plans will be one of Annex 4's priorities.)

-jamie

From: McKay, Jennifer (EC/EC) [<mailto:jennifer.mckay@canada.ca>]
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2016 3:17 PM
To: Korleski, Christopher <korleski.christopher@epa.gov>
Cc: Schardt, James <schardt.james@epa.gov>; Kumar, Ashij (EC/EC) <ashij.kumar@canada.ca>; Torchia, Carla (EC/EC) <carla.torchia@canada.ca>
Subject: Progress Report of the Parties

Hi Chris,

Just so you know, we met with Susan Humphrey this afternoon on the Progress Report of the Parties. She is in agreement with sending out the Nutrients Chapter to all the Annex leads as the format/template for input (while ignoring text as it will be revised).

One thing that came up during our discussion was the reference to “By 2018...” she was wondering what the rationale was for including this since the progress report documents the first 3 years of progress and the domestic action plans won’t be completed until later. Is this just to show that they are on our radar? Wouldn’t this be better under the “Priorities for Science and Action”?

I’ll volunteer to draft the email to co-leads for your review so we can get this out on Monday, unless you think it should be combined with the email on drafting priorities for science and action.

Thanks! Have a good weekend,

Jennifer McKay

Manager, Great Lakes Environment Office

Environment and Climate Change Canada / Government of Canada

Jennifer.mckay@canada.ca Tel: 416-739-5712

Jennifer McKay

Gestionnaire, Bureau de l’environnement des Grands Lacs

Environnement et Changements Climatiques Canada / Gouvernement du Canada

Jennifer.mckay@canada.ca Tél. : 416-739-5712

